

ADAMS EVANS P.A.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ATTORNEYSRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 06 2006

W. THAD ADAMS, III
J. SCOTT EVANS
STEPHEN S. ASHLEY, JR.
MATTHEW J. LADENHEIM
JONATHAN M. HINES
BRANDON C. TREGO
KATHRYN A. GROMLOVITS
SETH L. HUDSON2180 Two Wachovia Center
301 South Tryon Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28282-1991
Telephone: (704) 375-9249
Facsimile: (704) 375-0729PATENTS
TRADEMARKS
COPYRIGHTS
UNFAIR COMPETITION
TRADE SECRETS
INTERNET LAW**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

TO: Examiner Strimbu, Gregory J.
Art Unit 3634

FROM: Stephen S. Ashley, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,394

DATE: February 6, 2006

FAX NO: 571-273-8300

RE: **Our File No. 148/291; U.S. Serial No. 10/049,256; Utility Patent Application for "FINGER PROTECTOR DEVICE"**

CONFIRMATION COPY	YES	NO	✓
TO FOLLOW:			

NUMBER OF PAGES Cover + 14

MESSAGE: Please see the attached:

- Transmittal Sheet
- Amended Brief dated February 6, 2006

for the above-referenced application filed in reply to Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated 01/04/2006.

Also please confirm receipt of this facsimile by return fax. Thank you.

Accounting Process Code:

If any problems in transmission occur, please contact: Myra Howell, Legal Assistant

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

THIS FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION AND ANY ATTACHMENTS MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION BELONGING TO THE SENDER WHICH IS PROTECTED BY THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE AND/OR ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT IMMUNITY. THE INFORMATION IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE RECIPIENT NAMED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISCLOSURE, COPYING, DISTRIBUTION OR THE TAKING OF ANY ACTION IN RELIANCE ON THE CONTENTS OF THIS INFORMATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE TO ARRANGE FOR RETURN DOCUMENTS AT OUR EXPENSE.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

+7043750729

T-896 P.002 F-563

FEB 06 2006


PTO/SB/21 (09-04)


Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/049,256	
	Filing Date	05/03/2002	
	First Named Inventor	Garvey, Frank Joseph	
	Art Unit	3634	
	Examiner Name	Strimbu, Gregory J.	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	15	Attorney Docket Number	0148/291

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): - Amended Brief - Fax Cover Sheet
Remarks - Please charge any applicable fees to deposit account No. 01-0265.		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT		
Firm Name	Adams Evans P.A.	
Signature		
Printed name	Stephen S. Ashley, Jr.	
Date	02/06/2006	Reg. No. 47,394

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:		
Signature		
Typed or printed name	Myra Howell	Date 02/06/2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

FEB 06 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPL. NO : 10/049,256
APPLICANT : GARVEY, Frank Joseph
FILED : May 3, 2002
TITLE : FINGER PROTECTOR DEVICE
TC/A.U. : 3634
EXAMINER : Strimbu, Gregory J.
DOCKET NO. : 148/291

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Applicant submits the following appeal brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37.

Real party in interest.

Frank J. Garvey is the sole inventor and owner of the subject application.

Related appeals and interferences.

Applicant originally filed an appeal brief in the above-referenced application on November 9, 2004. However, a Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief was mailed by the Patent Office on March 1, 2004. In response, Applicant submitted a second appeal

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 2

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 06 2006

brief on September 1, 2005 to correct the points of non-compliance cited in the Notification of March 1, 2004. On January 4, 2006, a second Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief was mailed by the Patent Office. Applicant submits this Appeal Brief to correct the points of non-compliance cited in the Notification of January 1, 2005. Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney on February 3, 2006, in which the Examiner provided clarification regarding the points of non-compliance. There are no other prior and pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Status of claims.

Claims 14-19, 22 and 25 are pending in this application and stand rejected. Claims 14, 15, 17-19, 22 and 25 are being appealed. Claims 1-13 were canceled in a preliminary amendment filed with the application. Claims 20, 21, 23 and 24 were canceled without prejudice in an Amendment dated July 22, 2003.

Status of amendments.

Applicant filed an amendment on November 8, 2004. Applicant filed the amendment for the purpose of cancelling claims, complying with a requirement of form set forth in a previous Office action, and to present rejected claims in better form for

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 3

consideration on appeal. In an Advisory Action mailed November 19, 2004, the Examiner refused to enter the amendments on the grounds that they raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal, and they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

Summary of claimed subject matter.

The claimed subject matter is recited in claim 14, which is the only independent claim involved in this appeal, and described in detail in the specification at page 3, line 31 to page 4, line 23, and Figures 1-4. With reference to Figure 1 of the application, the subject matter being claimed is a finger protector device (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 10; page 3, lines 31-32) having a first member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 16; page 4, line 3), a second member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 14; page 4, line 4) and a third member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 12; page 4, line 12), the second member (14) being connected to the first member (16) and third member (12) by flexible sections (Fig. 1; Ref. Nos. 22, 24; page 4, lines 3-5). With reference to Figures 1 and 4, the first member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 16; page 4, lines 12-14) is arranged, in use, to be mounted to a first surface (Fig. 4; Ref. No. 30; page 4, lines 10-11) by a first mounting portion (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 20; page 4, lines 10-11) connected to the first member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 16; page 4, lines 13-14) by a first flexible section (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 28; page 4, line 13) which is pre-biased at about 90° such that the first member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 16; page 4,

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 4

line 18) and the first mounting portion (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 20, page 4, lines 17-18) are biased to a relative position of about 90°. The third member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 12; page 4, line 13) is arranged, in use, to be mounted to a second surface (Fig. 4; Ref. No. 32; page 4, line 11) by a second mounting portion (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 18, page 4, lines 10-14) connected to the third member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 12, page 4, lines 12-14) by a second flexible section (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 26; page 4, lines 13-14) which is pre-biased at about 90° such that the third member (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 12; page 4, line 18) and the second mounting portion (Fig. 1; Ref. No. 18; page 4, line 17-18) are biased to a relative position of about 90°, in which relative movement of the first surface (Fig. 4; Ref. No. 30; page 4, line 20) and the second surface (Fig. 4; Ref. No. 32; line 21) is possible, and in which each of the mounting portions (Fig. 1; Ref. Nos. 18, 20; page 4, lines 12-13) is attached to a member (Fig. 1; Ref. Nos. 12, 16; page 4, line 13) by flexible plastics (Fig. 1; Ref. Nos. 26, 28; page 4, lines 13-14). The term "flexible means" refers to flexible hinge sections described in page 4, lines 13-14 of the specification and shown at reference numerals 26, 28 in Figure 1.

Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal.

The following rejections are to be reviewed on appeal. In the Office action mailed October 7, 2003, the Examiner rejected all pending claims 14-19, 22 and 25. Claims 14-19, 22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 5

applicant regards as the invention. Claims 14-19 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,220,708 to Lucas et al. in view of British Patent Publication No. 2138478. Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,220,708 to Lucas et al. in view of British Patent Publication No. 2138478 as applied to claims 14-19 and 25. The Examiner's rejections were made final.

Argument.

Rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner states that recitations such as "flexible means" on line 3 of claim 14 render the claims indefinite, because the applicant has attempted to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function, however, no function is specified by the word(s) preceding or following "means." As noted above, applicant has filed, prior to the filing of this brief, an amendment to the claims, which has not yet been entered. In the amendment, the reference to "flexible means" at line 4 of claim 14 has been amended to "flexible sections". In addition, applicant's proposed amendment clarifies which "member" is being referred to throughout claim 14.

The examiner also based the §112 rejection on applicant's use of the term "pre-biased at about 90°." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's contention that the term "pre-biased" is confusing and unclear. It is a commonly used technique in plastics manufacturing to provide a bias to a plastics component so that it is not, at rest,

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 6

in a flat configuration. Thus, it has been "previously-biased" or "pre-biased" to about 90°. It should be noted that Applicant has received examination reports for related applications from the United Kingdom and European Patent Office Examiners, and neither had any objection to this term.

The examiner suggests that the reference to pre-biasing to 90° is unclear because Figure 1 of the application shows the mounting portions at approximately 180° relative to the first and third members respectively. The Examiner has apparently assumed incorrectly that Figure 1 of the subject application shows the device in an "at rest" configuration. In fact, the configuration shown is that adopted when the device is mounted on a closed door as shown in Figure 2. Nevertheless, Applicant's proposed amendment of claim 1 attempts to further clarify what is meant by pre-biased.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner contends that U.S. Patent No. 5,220,708 to Lucas et al. (hereinafter "Lucas") discloses "a finger protection device 14 comprising first 28, 29, second 27 and third 26 members". However, what the Examiner refers to as a first member in Lucas is in fact two separate members, as shown in Figure 1 and as highlighted by the use of two reference numerals to refer to them. Accordingly, this feature of the claim is not disclosed.

Applicant submits that Lucas does not disclose a first member attached to a mounting portion, a third member attached to a mounting portion, and both being attached to a common second member. Considering Figure 1 of Lucas, there is a first member (26),

~~Appl. No. 10/049,256~~

Appeal Brief

February 6, 2006

Page 7

second member (27), third member (28) and fourth member (29) between the "mounting portions" (25 and 30). The third member (28) of Lucas satisfies the requirement that it be connected to the second member (27), however, it is not attached to a mounting portion (25 or 30). If the members (26-29) are numbered differently, either the same distinction arises, or the first, second and third members are connected/attached to one another. Accordingly, Lucas does not disclose every limitation of claim 14.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting claim 14 as obvious over Lucas in light of British Patent Publication No. 2,138,478 to Maguire (hereinafter "Maguire"). The Examiner is correct in pointing out that Lucas does not disclose pre-biasing at about 90 degrees. Lucas discloses a self-trimming shield for a door heel, the operation of which is best illustrated in Figures 1 and 2.

Column 2, lines 35-41, of Lucas state that the "joints 52 and 50 are preferably formed with sufficient articulation resistance to provide a constant bias, which urge panels 26 and 27 away from the pinch point formed between door heel 15 and casing joints 16." This is to prevent inversion of the shield during operation. Referring to Figure 1 of Lucas, the joints 52 and 50 are pre-biased so that they tend to force the door open. However, joint 50 is shown at about 90 degrees in Figure 1, implying that it is biased away from this angle in order to exert a force when in this configuration. Thus, to have joint 50 pre-biased to about 90 degrees, as required by amended claim 1, is contrary to the teaching of Lucas.

Furthermore, with reference to Maguire, there is no disclosure therein that the mounting portions 5 and 6 are pre-biased to about 90 degrees. Figure 1 shows a

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 8

cross-section of the device, but there is no disclosure that this is the "at rest" configuration thereof. Additionally, there is no teaching in Maguire as to why mounting portions might be pre-biased or what advantage(s) this might provide. Accordingly, there is no teaching discernable to a person skilled in the art as to why such a configuration, which it is denied is disclosed at any rate, would be used elsewhere. The Examiner states that it is common practice to show elements of an invention in an unstressed state. Applicant respectfully submits that it is just as common to show elements of an invention in a stressed state. For instance in Figure 1 of the subject application the device is not shown in its unstressed state. The Examiner's assertion to the contrary is an erroneous assumption. Figure 1 of Maguire has to show the device in a shaped configuration because otherwise it would not be possible to see where the bends in it are. There are no lines showing plastics joints.

Accordingly, Maguire does not teach the pre-bias as claimed in the subject application. Additionally, assuming any such disclosure did exist, which it does not, it would not be consistent with the teaching of Lucas to include such an arrangement therein.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that claims 14, 15, 17-19, 22 and 25 are in a condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account for fees associated with the filing of this Brief.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen S. Ashley, Jr.
Reg. No. 47,394

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 9

Stephen S. Ashley, Jr.
ADAMS EVANS P.A.
2180 Two Wachovia Center
301 S. Tryon Street
Charlotte, NC 28282
TEL: (704) 375-9249
FAX:(704) 375-0729
E-MAIL: ssa@adamspat.com
Confirmation No. 8425

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office to
Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on February 6, 2006.

Signature: Myra P. Howell 1/6/06
Myra P. Howell Date of Signature

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 10

*Claims Appendix
for Appeal Brief in Application No. 10/049,256*

Claim 14: A finger protector device comprising first, second and third members, the second member being connected to the first and third members by flexible means, the first member is arranged, in use, to be mounted to a first surface by a first mounting portion connected to the first member by a first flexible section and the third member is arranged, in use, to be mounted to a second surface by a second mounting portion connected to the third member by a second flexible section; in which relative movement of the first and second surfaces is possible and in which each of said mounting portions is attached to a member by a flexible plastics joint, which is pre-biased at about 90° relative to the member to which it is attached.

Claim 15: A finger protector device according to claim 14, in which the flexible sections provide a pivotal connection.

Claim 17: A finger protector device according to claim 14, in which the first surface is a door.

Claim 18: A finger protector device according to claim 14, in which the second surface is a door frame.

Appl. No. 10/049,256

Appeal Brief

February 6, 2006

Page 11

Claim 19: A finger protector device according to claim 14, in which the first, second and third members are elongate members.

Claim 22: A finger protector device according to Claim 14, in which each of said mounting portions is thicker than the first, second and third members.

Claim 25: A finger protector device according to claim 14, in which the door frame is connected to the first mounting portion which is pivotally connected to the first member which is pivotally connected to the second member which is pivotally connected to the third member which is pivotally connected to the second mounting portion which is connected to a door, and wherein the first, second and third members and the first and second mounting portions are all elongate members, and further wherein the finger protector device has a substantially uniform cross-section along its length.

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 12

*Evidence Appendix
for Appeal Brief in Application No. 10/049,256*

No evidence has been submitted in this case.

Appl. No. 10/049,256
Appeal Brief
February 6, 2006
Page 13

*Related Proceedings Appendix
for Appeal Brief in Application No. 10/049,256*

There have been no decisions rendered in any related proceedings.

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.